

### III. REMARKS

The present invention relates to method and apparatus for sending textual user messages from a user to a primary mobile station which can receive both voice and text. Textual messages so addressed are sent to a secondary mobile station of a recipient regardless of whether the primary mobile station is in use and whether notification messages indicating the receipt of textual user messages are used.

The present invention has many advantages. The user need not carry with him his primary station but can carry only smaller and lighter secondary station. If several secondary stations are in use, a text message can be directed to only one such station. Also the user can call the primary station of another user regardless of the message transfer function.

On page 2 of the Office action the Examiner argues that Ghisler disclosed a method "...message, containing information from the user", the user recited by the Examiner to be POT 101, subscriber A. In reality, no textual message, e.g., "meeting at (date)(time)", was received FROM the user only information OF (subscriber A, POT); e.g., time remaining in display 404, was received. This is why Ghisler is totally different art. To start with, a textual message **from** POT is not present in Ghisler. A textual message from subscriber A is also missing in Ghisler.

Concerning Pepe, it is pointed out that the Examiner has not pointed out the portion of this reference which discloses the motivation to combine it with Ghisler, see Ex Parte Jones 62 USPQ 1206, 1208. Further, since Pepe also fails to disclose the above discussed features, combining it with Ghisler does not result in the present invention. Also, if the system of Pepe is combined

with the system of Ghisler, a problem occurs: where to direct the messages if only one terminal is active? The claims have been amended to recite that the message is from a user. This distinguishes over this reference combination since the message therein are of the user terminal.

Thus the rejection of claims 1-2, 4-6, 9-13, 15 and 17-18 under 35 U.S.C. 103 on this combination of references should be withdrawn.

Similarly, the Examiner fails to point out in Nguyen where it provides the motivation to combine it with the two previous references. Further, since it fails to disclose the above discussed features, the result is not the present invention even if such a combination is made. Thus, the rejection of claims 3, 7, 14 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. 103 of the combination of Ghisler, Pepe and Nguyen should be withdrawn.

For all of the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now present in the application are clearly novel and patentable over the prior art of record, and are in proper form for allowance. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration and allowance is respectfully requested. Should any unresolved issues remain, the Examiner is invited to call Applicants' attorney at the telephone number indicated below.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge payment for any fees associated with this communication or credit any over payment to Deposit Account No. 16-1350.

Respectfully submitted,

Henry L. Steckler  
Henry L. Steckler  
Reg. No. 24,139

Feb 23, 2004  
Date

Perman & Green, LLP  
425 Post Road  
Fairfield, CT 06824  
(203) 259-1800  
Customer No.: 2512

#### CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service on the date indicated below as first class mail in an envelope addressed to the Commissioner of Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

Date: 2/23/04

Signature: Emolina Rodriguez  
Person Making Deposit